

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2488 OF 2005

Nalini Naresh Kumta ... Petitioner
Vs.
Rajendra Pawar and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Reymond for Petitioner.

Mr. P.G. Sawant, A.G.P. for R, .Nos. 1 and 3.

Mr. S.B. Deshmukh for R.No. 2.

**CORAM: F.I. REBELLO &
ANOO P V. MOHTA, JJ.
DATED: OCTOBER 12, 2006**

P.C.:

. The learned counsel points out that Respondent No. 2 has been served. Even otherwise, for the order to be passed, presence of the Respondent not required to dispose of the matter.

. It is the case of the petitioners that there is mis-management by Respondent No. 2 and as such Respondent No.1 should be directed to conduct an enquiry. The matter was filed in 2005. Considering the passage of time, if the petitioners file a fresh representation to Respondent No. 1, Respondent No. 1 to consider the same and dispose of the same according to law, after hearing Respondent No. 2 not later than eight weeks from the date of such representation.

. With the said observations, Petition disposed of.

(ANOO P V. MOHTA, J.)

(F.I.REBELLO, J.)